

**ED 780
RESEARCH ON TEACHING¹
Winter 2018**

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Instructor | Deborah Loewenberg Ball |
| Campus office | 4002 SEB |
| Email | dball@umich.edu |
| Phone | 734.972.4793 |

Room 2346
School of Education

Class meetings:

Mondays
1:00–4:00 p.m.

Exceptions:

No class: Monday, January 15
(Martin Luther King Jr. Day and University Symposium)

No class: Monday, February 26
(Spring break)

Reschedule last class (April 16) to April 20

I will regularly use email to communicate with you; I encourage you to do the same with me, and with others in the class. Please check your email regularly. I will respond to all email messages within 24 hours.

To make the management of class files easier and more reliable, please title class documents with a standard label, i.e.: <assign1_lastname.docx>, or <paper#1_lastname.docx>. You will submit all assignments to the course Canvas site.

COURSE POLICIES AND PRINCIPLES

Academic and Professional Integrity

It is expected that each member of the course will submit original work and will appropriately cite others' work referenced in assignment submissions. If you are unsure about how to correctly cite others, please ask. Please refer to the following website for U-M policies and procedures regarding academic and professional integrity:

http://www.soe.umich.edu/file/academic_integrity/

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

If you think you need an accommodation for a disability, please let me know at your earliest convenience. Some aspects of this course—the assignments, the in-class activities, and the way the course is taught—may be modified to facilitate your participation and progress. As soon as you make me aware of your needs, I will work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) to help me determine appropriate academic accommodations. SSD typically recommends accommodation through a Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. Any information you provide is private and confidential and will be treated as such. SSD contact information: 734-763-3000; <https://ssd.umich.edu/>

Diversity and Respect in the Classroom Community

In order to create community and spaces where people share their ideas and views and are open to hearing others, and where we seek to challenge and change patterns of marginalization and privilege, the following core principles are fundamental and expected:

¹ I thank Chauncey Monte-Sano for generously sharing with me her syllabus for this course, on which I drew as I developed this one. I also acknowledge Chandra Alston, David Cohen, and Suzanne Wilson who are important influences on my thinking and practice in teaching doctoral courses.



- Respect: We must respect and value the efforts, identities, capacities, and ideas that each person brings into the space. We call people their chosen names and we make the effort to learn and to say their names as they wish them said.
- Curiosity and openness: We must all be open to alternative views, experiences, and perspectives, and curious to learn about and from one another. Freedom to express ourselves, a fundamental civil and human right, excludes expressions that commit or encourage violence or trauma toward others. I do not invite racist, sexist, classist, and, generally, bigoted ideas, nor am I inviting tolerance or respect for such ideas. Judgments about this are part of the responsibility that a free and just society entails.
- Diversity: We stand for the goals of diversity, inclusion, justice, and equity expressed in our school community's statement of institutional commitments: <http://www.soe.umich.edu/diversity/>. Acting on these commitments in our day to day work together means that we each must cultivate awareness of our own biases and perspectives. Actively advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice requires that we are mindful of our ways of being, listening, talking. Being cognizant of our own biases and perspectives and actively working to advance diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice will require each of us to critically interrogate the materials, ideas, structures, and contexts we examine, and the ways in which we examine them in our work together.

Appreciation

Our opportunities to learn together in this course owe a great deal to the work of many others who labor to ensure that classes are held in clean and heated rooms, that the technology works to support our learning, and that we have the supplies we need, and access to the materials and resources we need.

I especially would like to thank Tina Sanford in the Educational Studies office, Mike Napolitan and David Kelley in the SOE Facilities office, and Joanna Elliot and Nate Blunt in Instructional Technology Services. These individuals and many unnamed others across campus are often invisible to us and are disproportionately people of color and low-income people, while their labor creates comfort and security for our school. In fact, their work is successful when it simply happens without attracting attention, yet they are often not accorded the respect and gratitude they deserve. Please join me whenever you can in expressing thankfulness for their skill and resourcefulness in making it possible to teach and learn here.

COURSE FOCUS AND LEARNING GOALS

EDUC 780, Research on Teaching, is a core requirement for students in the Teaching and Teacher Education doctoral specialization area in Educational Studies. The course is also appropriate for graduate students interested in the study of teaching and learning, teacher education and professional development, and curriculum, who focus in or across particular curricular domains. This could include academic subjects, such as physics or history, or other areas such as music, computer programming, or physical education. Those interested in improving instruction in higher education might find the course useful in understanding what is involved in teaching and in studying and warranting its quality. This course also provides an opportunity to consider the nature of research: What distinguishes research-based ways of knowing from other ways of knowing? What ranges and kinds of inquiry and claim comprise research? What counts as evidence for what sorts of assertions?

Because this course focuses on studying teaching and research on teaching, we might expect in this course to ask and answer, "What do we know about teaching and how do we know it?" This might seem straightforward to investigate. What *has* been learned about the practice of teaching? What *is* known about teaching—its tasks, its key influences and entailments, its effects, the people who do it, what it takes to learn it?

However, closer scrutiny of these questions reveals several challenges. One is what to mean by "teaching." A second is the "we" and who has studied, written, and made claims about teaching. How these two challenges are acknowledged and dealt with shapes what is "known"; we will want to examine this critically.

Claims about the practice of teaching and teachers are made and justified in a wide variety of ways. Observers pay attention to different aspects of teaching, use different sources and kinds of information and experience, blend insight and interpretation with beliefs and values. What they know may appear from another perspective as little more than an implicit assumption or the result of a limited frame of reference. Epistemologies vary. Our aim is first to examine what is known from a variety of perspectives. Beyond that, we will seek to compare analytically what counts as knowledge as well as what is known, by whom and for whom, how as well as why.

Three sets of questions will guide our work this term:

1. What is meant by **teaching**? What does it mean to distinguish "kinds of" teaching? Is there anything theoretically or conceptually overarching about "teaching" as a human and societal practice?



2. What *is* included in **research on teaching**? What is *not*, as well as what tends to be overlooked or excluded? How has the field of “research on teaching” developed? Who are the scholars who have been influential in its development, and why? What have been the consequences for what is “known” about teaching and for how such “knowledge” has or has not shaped educational practice and policy, and for whom?
3. What are (and have been over time) different **methods** of studying teaching, including “measuring” it? How do particular ways of studying teaching interact with the reproduction or disruption of historical patterns of marginalization and inequity in schools? How else might teaching be studied?

Focal Topics, Methods, and Questions

Teaching, the core profession of education, is a profoundly complex practice. It is one of the most ancient human practices as well as the most common. It is cognitive, social, relational, and moral. It is both personal and professional. It involves technique, beliefs, knowledge, and imagination. It is contingent, situated in contexts and persons. Are there general qualities or dimensions of teaching across this variability? How is research on teaching related to research on learning, classrooms, or schools?

Knowledge, beliefs, claims, and widely-shared assumptions about about teaching. Some of these inform policy and professional education. At the same time, other knowledge, practice, and ideas remain invisible, unexamined, and unknown. This course will explore the field of “research on teaching” and also interrogate what and who have constituted this field of education research, in what contexts, with what consequences, and for whom. We will also ask questions about teaching itself and what it might mean to study it. And we will keep asking ourselves how these issues interact with broader struggles for democracy and justice through public education.

With these problems embedded in what seems a straightforward question, we will set out to puzzle and to learn about teaching. We will draw on what we and many others have experienced, watched, done, and studied. The sites for our exploration will include texts, our own experience, artifacts of teaching, and other people. At the same time, we will cultivate a stance of critical inquiry and consciousness about whose voices, perspectives, and experiences are refracted through knowledge of and research on teaching, and whose are not. How does teaching reproduce larger structural and historical racism, sexism, and other patterns of exclusion and power, and (how) can it challenge and disrupt such structures?

One aim of the course is to develop a deeper understanding of the practice of teaching through the study of a variety of texts, from different disciplines and traditions, representing different communities and voices. The time period of inquiry will be roughly 1900 through the present, in the U.S. and in other countries and societies. We will seek to understand what has been in focus about teaching and in what ways, where, when, and by whom. To what extent is there shared language, conceptualization, and knowledge, and why is that? What (or whose) knowledge of teaching has been overlooked and would challenge taken for granted assumptions about what good teaching is?

A second aim will be to examine classic approaches to the study of teaching. We will read historical, sociological, and narrative texts about teaching. We will read both scholarly and other kinds of literature. How have different people tried to know and write about teaching? Who have they been and whom or what have they influenced? What do different perspectives and kinds of texts offer us in terms of insight into teaching? What does each highlight, and in what ways? What does each obscure or overlook? We will examine the development of the field we call “research on teaching.” This strand will be set within the larger range of texts we will read, many of which are either not research, or are not within the field of “research on teaching.” However, one aim will be to develop a beginning sense of how research on teaching emerged and how it has evolved and changed through several major periods over the last four decades.

A third aim will be to consider questions about the conceptualization of distinct “kinds” of teaching. We will closely examine some together, including culturally relevant pedagogy and direct instruction; you will complement this work with your own inquiry.

We will learn how others have tried to ask and answer the course core questions, the assertions that others have made, and the bases on which they make them. We will seek to understand a range of perspectives and approaches, and will exercise and develop our capacities to communicate with others—including those outside of education—about teaching and what is known about it. We will also probe our own knowledge of teaching. As learners and teachers, we have developed lenses and frameworks that shape what we pay attention to, what we



ask and what we see. We will examine what has and has not been examined about teaching, and in what ways, by whom, with what kinds of results, and will analyze what we do not know that seems crucial to probe.

We will learn that these questions are both disputed and old. That they are so does not mean that sensible positions cannot be taken, and you will be working on developing your own. But it is important to see the extent to which these are matters on which there is disagreement and to consider carefully what issues divide, and what the grounds are for particular arguments. That you have taught professionally is an important resource, and it is important to learn ways to draw on it in disciplined ways that make it usable resource.

The questions we will explore are at the heart of understanding learning, as well as education and schooling. They are foundational to policy issues such as who should become a teacher, what they should know and be able to do, and how their work should be supported and appraised.

This preface suggests that we will be venturing into difficult territory in this course. There are no settled answers to the questions that are the territory of this course, despite the fact that they seem to be the most obvious of the challenges of education. We will explore the issues above to develop workable provisional answers, and will consider how the issues may be further explored in subsequent investigations.

Learning Practices of Scholarship

In addition to these specific substantive goals, the course is designed to help you cultivate a variety of practices and stances important for disciplined scholarly and professional work. These include: how you think, analyze, argue, and write; how you experiment and play with ideas; how you keep track of your ideas as well as those of others; how you entertain conflicting perspectives and arguments; and how you use texts, discussions, interactions, people, and experiences to help yourself think and learn. Reading a wide range of historical and contemporary material is important, including studying the work of well-known scholars and thinkers. But, in addition, because such foundations have often been shaped by only some voices, and predominantly white and male perspectives, we will reach and study other work, work that will contribute to building our perspectives, and improving our questions as well as our provisional answers. Reading broadly, well beyond the obvious boundaries of any particular field, matters a lot. This means seeking and reading in other domains—philosophy, for example, or political science. It also means using fiction, film, essays, podcasts, and other resources that can help you see connections, ask better questions, and come up with new insights. This course is designed to focus explicitly on methods and forms of inquiry, thought, and expression—particularly methods of interpretation, analysis, and argument, as well as approaches to reading and forms of writing—that are fundamental to good scholarship as well as skillful practice.

The nature of the course work will involve interpreting and analyzing texts, artifacts, observations, experiences, and other materials, framing and revising questions, making conjectures, and testing alternative assertions. All this involves taking intellectual risks, being both playful and disciplined. Establishing a culture in which such work is valued, encouraged, and supported is part of our collective work. Each of you brings different experiences, interests, perspectives, and expertise. Who you each are and what you bring to the class can be resources for the course, if we learn to make use of them, and of one another, generously and inquisitively.

The course itself is also a case of teaching and learning which can become one more resource for our inquiry. Collectively, we can examine and analyze what each of us—as teachers and students—does as we construct the curriculum, discourse, relations, and culture of the class. Doing that requires attention to practices of teaching and learning, and making that attention part of the course work. I will regularly solicit your feedback and comments on the course content and instruction, and I will share these back with you for our collective consideration of the work of teaching.

Reading²

We will read a wide range of texts, including empirical and conceptual work about teaching; work in particular disciplines and domains; articles in the public media; reports of commissions and panels; writing about other professions and practices; and even dictionaries. The work of the class will depend on reading interactively, on bringing both collective and individual goals to reading, considering, and reconsidering texts. In its most straightforward expression, this involves bringing questions to think about while preparing to read something, reading

² This section on intellectual practices has evolved over many years and a wide range of courses that I have taught with colleagues, including Chandra Alston, Dan Chazan, David Cohen, Michael Sedlak, and Suzanne Wilson, as well as on my own. Teaching graduate courses is always a work in progress for many distinctive reasons, and the development of what David Cohen calls the “meta-curriculum” of graduate school is always one of the most fascinating parts of teaching at this level.



a text, and reflexively placing what one has read in the context of both evolving scholarship on a subject and one's own development as a scholar.

The following sets of questions offer a framework for reading generously and critically in ways that support learning:

1. *Who is the author—in terms of identity, context, times, disciplinary training and orientation, experience, and approach to inquiry?*
We will learn more about each of the people whose work we read, study, and analyze. I will ask you to contribute to our collective understanding of our authors by taking turns at sharing some insights about them and the contexts of their work.
2. *What is the author trying to say, claim, or argue?*
What are the principal and subsidiary arguments or theses? To whom is the author writing? What are the important conceptual terms? What does the author seem to assume? What sorts of evidence and methods are used? Can you identify specific passages that support your interpretation? Are there other passages that either contradict or appear less consistent with your understanding? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument? Can you make sense of, or account for, these differences?
3. *What is the author's purpose and how has the author constructed the text, and with what audience in mind?*
Why was this work written? To whom is the author writing and talking, against, or for? How do the author's arguments fit within various communities of discourse? How is a piece of work connected to the efforts of others dedicated to similar purposes? In what community or communities does the author locate him or herself? What can you know or infer about the author's motivation and on what do you base that? What is the author *doing* in this text?³ What is the logic of the text's structure? What clues can you get from the text's design and structure? Does its organization give you insights into the argument? Are there patterns in the author's presentation that help you to locate and understand the most valuable material? What can you do to concentrate your attention to and interrogation of the text? How does the author treat the words and concepts central to the work? How does the author use language to distinguish their argument from others'? What seems to be missing and is it deliberate (as in setting a boundary) or implicit or invisible?
4. *What is the relationship between the author's assumptions and ideas and your own understanding?*
How might your response to the work be affected by your values, beliefs, and commitments? Can you read and make sense of the work on its own terms? How does the author's treatment of a particular concept or word interact with yours?

Discussion

Creating thoughtful arguments requires making conjectures and offering justification for them. Sometimes justification comes from the texts—specific references to an argument that an author has made well. At other times, justification is based on the logical analysis of a term or set of ideas. Sometimes arguments are more empirically based, grounded in data or in disciplined use of experience.

The course will be run as a seminar. Your participation in discussions and in class activities is important not only for your own learning but also for others'. What you learn in this course will be influenced by the degree of everyone's engagement in and contributions to the discussions. Preparing the readings and coming to class with questions, insights, and issues is crucial to making the course work; I rely on everyone's contributions and participation. Building the culture of the class so that genuine inquiry is possible will take all of our efforts to make the seminar a context in which people communicate and are listened to, in which evidence of a wide range matters, in which thoughtful questioning of one another's claims is desirable, and in which alternative perspectives and interpretations are valued. Because we will investigate a complex topic, we will need to try out ideas that are only partially developed. Doing so is an important part of developing the capacity to think in disciplined ways. How we listen to one another's ideas, assist with the formulation of an interpretation, and question or challenge ideas will affect the quality of what we can do together. How we listen to others' reactions to our ideas, accommodate critique and questions, change our minds—revise at some times, and reinforce our analyses at others—all of these things will affect the intellectual culture of the class.

We will develop and maintain norms that can support our work together. Listening carefully, treating ideas with respect and interest, raising and responding to questions, sharing the floor—all these will matter in constructing an

³ See, for example, Joseph Schwab, "Enquiry and the reading process," for a thorough unpacking of what it means to examine a text.



environment where satisfying and challenging intellectual work can take place. One part of exploring an idea or an argument is to attend closely to it to understand its logic, intention, meaning. Listening generously, assuming that ideas and claims are made for good reasons, is crucial to thinking well. Another part is to be skeptical, to consider what is missing or logically flawed. Using both—generosity and skepticism—contributes to careful unpacking of ideas and to good thinking.

It is also important to reflect on the sort of support you need from me and other faculty. What are you working on, trying to learn or do, or finding particularly intriguing or challenging? What is helpful to you, and what have you learned about the ways in which you use instructors and their teaching that might enable you to use this course and its teacher and teaching in useful and productive ways?

Making Records

One's ability to profit from conversations, reading, listening, and just musing depends on figuring out useful ways to keep track of one's ideas, thinking, and questions. Sometimes one is trying to get clearer about a concept or develop an argument. Across conversations or readings, there can be many opportunities where one finds oneself thinking but too often without any good system for keeping track.

In courses, too, a great deal can whiz by in class discussions; reading often precipitates an overflow of thoughts and ideas not yet processed. In discussions, sometimes a group can lose track of important points, or develop only one aspect of an idea. Potential connections are lost because we forget an earlier point. To enable closer consideration of the "text" we produce as we work in class, we will sometimes make collective public records of our discussions, texts to which we can all refer (for example, in a Google doc, or on posters) and that we can modify and extend as we continue to work. Suggestions about ways to do this are welcome and are part of your role in developing ourselves as a learning community.

This term would be a good opportunity to extend the ways you use to record and track your own thinking and learning, both independently and with and from others in our class. I will share some ways I use for making records, and also encourage you to experiment and to share what you do with others.

Writing

Writing is a fourth important vehicle for exploring and clarifying ideas, for trying out interpretations and arguments, and for representing ideas and communicating with others. Writing plays a central role in graduate work, and in educational scholarship and practice. It is an important part of learning to participate in a community of educational scholars and practitioners who have a specialized discourse. The course will provide occasions to focus on and develop these new aspects of your writing, and the writing assignments are structured to provide guidance and resources, as well as the opportunity for comments and suggestions. Writing will be developed through cycles of design, experimenting, drafting, getting feedback, revising and developing, and refining. The guidance I will provide is designed to support you in your writing assignments for this course, with the goal not only of scaffolding these tasks, but also of helping you extend your practice and habits as a writer.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The requirements for this course have been developed deliberately to support your learning of key practices of scholarly work and to engage you in different sorts of exploration and analysis that will support your learning in this course, but also beyond. In this section, I provide an overview of each of the main projects, their scope, design, and timeframe. More details will be provided separately to guide the stages and components of each of these.

1. Conceptual Project: Views of Good Teaching

A perennial question is what is "good teaching" and what would it mean to ask and answer this question. Teaching is frequently labeled with adjectives, including "effective," "liberatory," "direct," "student-centered," and "reform."

This is interesting because other professions (e.g., nursing, social work) do not typically deploy this array of labels for practice. Implicit in these labels for teaching are aims, judgments, and values, but they are also very different from one another in their specificity, referents, and warrants. This project involves assembling a list of such labels for teaching, and choosing a set of no more than four to unpack conceptually, analyze their definition and use, and compare. How are they used, and by whom, and what is the basis for applying them to particular instances of teaching? How are they related to research or to practice? Based on your analysis of your set of labels, what do you conclude about the desirability of labels for "good" teaching?

You will begin to work on this project right away, and will develop a first draft by February 5. You will work with one other person in the course to develop your ideas; you and your partner will listen to each other's thinking,



read rough drafts, and provide written feedback to each other on your first drafts. Based on feedback from me and your partner, as well as our reading and discussion in class, you will continue to develop your analysis and argument. Your revised paper will be due on March 9.

2. Handbook Analysis Project

Five volumes of the *Handbook of Research on Teaching* have been produced as projects of the American Educational Research Association over the last 55 years, in 1963, 1973, 1986, 2001, and 2016. Each volume comprises over 1000 pages of chapters, inventorying the shape and scope of the field of research on teaching.

We will divide into five groups to analyze what these books tell us about this field at different points in time, as represented in these field-based compilations. We will consider the emergence, disappearance, persistence, and evolution of particular kinds of focus, methods, concerns, and interests, as well as what these handbooks—and “handbooks” in general—tell us about who and what was shaping the field and in what ways. In what ways have contexts, cultures, social identities, and politics figured in research on teaching?

We will begin this project on February 19 in order to provide enough time to begin examining the handbooks and to plan our work. We will regularly devote some in-class time to work in groups and to be able to confer and improve our collective investigations. I own each of these enormous books and we can use my copies for this project. (You might also be able to procure some editions from the University of Michigan library.) Our classes on March 19 and March 26 will focus on the products of the groups’ work and connect it to our study of the field of research on teaching. Each group will present their analysis.

Your work will involve collaborating with your group to produce an analysis based on the handbook you are assigned. You will prepare as a group a presentation for class and you will present one section of it in class. Following the in-class presentations and discussions, you will write a short reflective memo about your learning from the handbook analysis, including 3–4 conclusions you drew from the work.

3. Book Review Essay Project

You will select two of the following books to read this semester. We will form book groups of those reading the same books so that you have opportunities to talk with others about the books you chose. You will write, with guidance, an essay on an issue that you identify as interesting to compare across the books. This work will be staged and scaffolded across the term, beginning with submitting a blueprint for your review essay and getting feedback. You will write two drafts of the review essay and receive feedback before writing and completing a final version, due at the end of the semester, after our last class. We will begin this work partway into the semester and will discuss possible ways to make choices about what to read, in light of the genre (book review essay) and your learning goals.

- a. Freire, Paulo. (1968/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum. (NOTE: 2018 marks 50 years since the first publication of this seminal book and might make this an interesting time to study it closely together with another work.)
- b. Gage, Nathaniel. (1978). *The scientific basis of the art of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- c. Jackson, Philip. (1968/1990). *Life in classrooms*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston/Teachers College Press.
- d. Lee, Carol. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- e. Stigler, James and Hiebert, James. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world’s teachers for improving education in the classroom*. New York: Free Press.

4. Across the term, you will do small exercises or tasks that contribute to your learning. These, together with your engagement in our weekly class sessions, comprise the remaining 25% of your grade.

GRADING AND EVALUATION

Your grade for this course will be based on the following distribution:

| Task | Product | Due | Percentage of final course grade |
|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Views of good teaching: Conceptual project | Short paper (≤ 1200 words) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First draft: February 5 • Revised draft: March 9 | 25% |



| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-----|
| Handbook analysis project | Presentation in class Reflective analysis (≤ 800 words) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft of main claims (group): March 12 • Slides and handout (group): March 19 • Reflective analysis (individual): April 2 | 25% |
| Book review essay | Essay (≤ 1800 words) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blueprint for essay: March 19 • First draft of essay: March 26 • Final essay: April 20 | 25% |
| Small assignments and in-class work | various | ongoing | 25% |

A few comments about evaluation in graduate work: I want your experiences in this course to contribute to your growing capacity to do excellent work. To support that, I will comment on your writing, offer suggestions, and encourage you to refine your ideas in a variety of ways and using different resources to do so.

You can use your work in this course, with one another and with me, to help you to improve your sense of what good work consists of, and how to produce it. This includes writing good sentences and paragraphs, using words carefully, treating ideas with discipline and respect. We will strive to make these standards as concrete as possible, and to make visible strategies for achieving them. As you develop your sensibilities, you will be able to do more and more as your own critic and editor.

One obvious reason to take writing seriously is that your career as a graduate student depends on it. Whether you are a master's student or a doctoral student, you will not be able to earn your degree unless you can write good papers, exams, and theses. I think of writing as a tool in learning and teaching. Providing scaffolding for your work, and direct and focused feedback on what you produce, are concrete ways to help you develop skills and sensibilities, and to be successful in the program.

A second, and perhaps even more important, reason to take your work seriously is that you intend to work as a professional in a field in which the overarching objective is helping students to learn, including learning to write. Moreover, improving the quality of the educational enterprise depends on communication among educators and with many publics. Good writing is unfortunately not something at which most professionals in public education have excelled. Current educational debate, like U.S. educational history and much teaching and writing in schools of education, is littered with jargon-filled, clumsy, and obscure writing. Some of the problems are technical or literary: incorrect grammar, a passion for the passive voice, and needless words. Many other problems are intellectual: arguments that wander, implausible assumptions, paragraphs that do not cohere, and a failure to consider other views respectfully. Professionals who communicate in such ways are in no position to help students learn to write, to help teachers learn to teach them to write, or to communicate well with the publics on which public education depends.

Please bear in mind that my comments are directed towards particular things you have produced, not about *you*. Improving your work is a joint endeavor, composed of what I can offer you by way of help and feedback, and how you use my guidance and that of your classmates.



COURSE SCHEDULE: READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS

PLEASE NOTE: Reading and writing assignments are listed with the class for which they are due. Assignments will be specified separately, with details about the tasks involved and the evaluation criteria.

| Date | Focus | Reading | Assignments |
|--|---|--|-------------|
| COURSE INTRODUCTION | | | |
| CLASS 1 January 8 | <p>Introductions to the course and to one another</p> <p>Overview of course scope, purposes, and work; guiding orientations to and norms for our work together</p> <p>Interrogating our ideas about “kinds” of teaching</p> | | |
| January 15 | NO CLASS—Martin Luther King Jr. Day | | |
| PART 1: What Are Central Problems of Teaching? | | | |
| CLASS 2 January 22 | <p>What is involved in conceptualizing teaching for the purpose of studying it? What are reasons for studying teaching?</p> <p>What is Cohen’s purpose and what is he trying to do with this book?</p> <p>What does Cohen mean by the “social resources” for and “terrains” of ambitious, attentive, responsible teaching?</p> | Cohen, David K. (2011). <i>Teaching and its predicaments</i> . Harvard University Press. | |



| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>CLASS 3 January 29</p> | <p>What is involved in conceptualizing teaching for the purpose of studying it?</p> <p>How does the teacher's "persona" figure in researchers' approaches to studying teaching?</p> | <p>Curren-Preis, M. (2018). <i>Creating and using the persona in teaching: Challenges of connection and control</i>. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 1, "The problem space." • Chapter 5, "Teachers' conceptions of their <i>persona work</i>." • Chapter 7, "Conclusions and directions for future research." <p>Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. (1963). The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), <i>Handbook of research on teaching</i> (pp. 506–582). Chicago: Rand McNally.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin developing your conceptual project (select terms, etc.) and discuss with your partner |
| <p>CLASS 4 February 5</p> | <p>What is involved in conceptualizing teaching for the purpose of studying it?</p> <p>Framing endemic challenges of teaching: What do Jackson, Lampert, and Lensmire identify?</p> <p>How do these compare with the frames of the authors we read the last three weeks?</p> | <p>a) Jackson, P. (1968). The daily grind. In <i>Life in classrooms</i> (pp. 1–37). New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.</p> <p>b) *Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 55(2), 178–194.</p> <p>c) Lensmire, T. (1993). Following the child, socioanalysis, and threats to community: Teacher response to student texts. <i>Curriculum Inquiry</i>, 23, 265–299.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due: First draft of conceptual project • Turn in to Canvas for me to read; send one copy to your project partner for feedback <p>Write feedback to your project partner this week; provide feedback by Friday, February 9</p> |
| <p>PART 2: Research on Teaching: Perspectives, Goals, and Voices</p> | | | |
| <p>CLASS 5 February 12</p> | <p>Direct instruction</p> <p>In the 1970s and 1980s, how were these different authors thinking about "direct" or "explicit" instruction (whether or not they used the same terms to refer to it)?</p> <p>How does the article by Au fit in the historical context of the other readings?</p> | <p>a) Au, K. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children: Analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. <i>Anthropology and Education Quarterly</i>, 11 (2), 91–115.</p> <p>b) Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 280–298.</p> | |



| | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | <p>What questions were these researchers asking, and what were their motivations and methods?</p> | <p>c) Gersten, R., and Carnine, D. (1986, April). Direct instruction in reading comprehension. <i>Educational Leadership</i>, 70–78.</p> <p>d) Video at link: https://goo.gl/ijGtA7 “Getting There: DISTAR Reading System” (1974).</p> <p>Optional: <i>This brief technical paper offers a summary of the range of uses of the term “direct instruction,” written by Barak Rosenshine who, in the 1970s, was among the leading researchers in the process-product tradition (which we will be discussing more next month):</i></p> <p>Rosenshine, B. (2008). <i>Five meanings of direct instruction</i>, (pp. 1–6). Lincoln, IL: Center for Innovation and Improvement.</p> | |
| <p>CLASS 6 February 19</p> | <p>Culturally relevant pedagogy</p> <p>What questions was Ladson-Billings asking and how did she go about her work?</p> <p>What are her key claims?</p> <p>How does her work fit with the different authors we read for last week?</p> | <p>Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (2009). <i>The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children</i>. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.</p> | |
| <p>February 26</p> | <p>NO CLASS — University of Michigan Spring Break</p> | | |
| <p>CLASS 7 March 5</p> | <p>Video meeting with Dr. Ladson-Billings at 1:00 p.m. (come at 12:50 p.m.)</p> <p>How has culturally-relevant pedagogy been taken up and why?</p> <p>What has been the trajectory of Dr. Ladson-Billings’ thinking and what has shaped that?</p> | <p><i>Continued:</i> Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (2009). <i>The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children</i>. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.</p> <p>Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: a.k.a. The remix. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 84, 74–85.</p> <p>Paris, Django, and Alim, Samy. (2014). <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 84, 85–100.</p> | <p>Due by March 9: Revised conceptual project paper, on Canvas and to your project partner</p> |



| | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | How do the works of Ladson-Billings, Cohen, Delpit, and Au that we have studied “talk” to one another? | Optional: View presentation by Dr. Ladson-Billings at the University of Notre Dame: https://goo.gl/kSeqPo <i>This presentation offers an opportunity to hear Dr. Ladson-Billings discuss culturally-relevant pedagogy and address a particular audience (Catholic school educators).</i> | |
| CLASS 8 March 12 | <i>Research on teaching I: The quest to link teachers' characteristics and behaviors to student outcomes</i> What were these researchers probing and what were their guiding assumptions about teaching? Why did they pursue the questions they did, and with what methods and perspectives? What and who are in focus and what is invisible? | a) Skim to develop a larger overview of the framework that Brophy and Good advance and their claims: Brophy, J. and Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), <i>Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd edition</i> , (pp. 328–375). New York: Macmillan. b) Good, T. (1979). Teacher effectiveness in the elementary school. <i>Journal of Teacher Education, 30</i> (2), 53–64. c) Palinscar, A. & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching: Comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. <i>Cognition and Instruction, 1</i> (2), 117–175. | |
| CLASS 9 March 19 | <i>Research on teaching II: The shift away from student outcomes to teachers' cognitions and knowledge</i> What were these researchers probing and what were their guiding assumptions about teaching? Why did they pursue the questions they did, and with what methods and perspectives? Were some assumptions consistent with the earlier research on teaching that we explored last week? Again: What and who are in focus and what is invisible? | a) Berliner, D. (1986). In search of the expert pedagogue. <i>Educational Researcher, 15</i> , 5–13. b) Clark, C. M. and Yinger, R. J. (1979). Teachers' thinking. In P. L. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), <i>Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications</i> , (pp. 231–263). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan. c) Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms for research on teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), <i>Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd edition</i> , (pp. 3–36). New York: Macmillan. | Draft claims for Handbook project, to discuss in class |



| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| CLASS 10 March 26 | David Cohen | Re-read: Cohen, David K. (2011). <i>Teaching and its predicaments</i> . Harvard University Press. | Professor David Cohen in class |
| CLASS 11 April 2 | <i>Research on teaching III: Putting student and teaching identities, contexts, and equity into the frame</i> And again: What and who are in focus and what is invisible? Continued: Methods of studying teaching | Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations, <i>Harvard Educational Review</i> , 257–301. | |
| PART 3: What Have Been Different Methods of Studying Teaching? | | | |
| CLASS 12 April 9 | Studying teaching: Making records of and measuring teaching | Possible readings: a) Rosenshine, B. V. & Furst, N. (1973). The use of direct observation to study teaching. In R. M. Travers (Ed.) <i>Second handbook of research on teaching</i> , (pp. 122–183). Chicago: Rand McNally. b) Ball, D. L., and Rowan, B. (2004). Measuring instruction. <i>Elementary School Journal</i> , 105, 3–10. c) Camburn, E. & Barnes, C. (2004). Assessing the validity of a language arts instruction log through triangulation. <i>Elementary School Journal</i> , 105, 49–73. d) Goffney, I. Measuring equitable mathematics instruction. e) Delaney, S., Ball, D., Schilling, S., Zopf, D. (2008). “Mathematical knowledge for teaching”: adapting U.S. measures for use in Ireland. <i>Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education</i> , 11, 171–197. f) Rowan, B. & Correnti, R. (2004). Studying reading instruction with teacher logs: Lessons from the study of instructional improvement. <i>Elementary School Journal</i> , 105, 120–131. | |
| CLASS 13 April 20* (note date change) | | | Book presentations: Teams present a conversation between the authors of the books |

